DETAILED ACTION

1. The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed. The following title is suggested: *Video Receiver Clock Correction with Notification*.

Double Patenting

2. When two claims in an application are duplicates or else are so close in content that they both cover the same thing, despite a slight difference in wording, it is proper after allowing one claim to object to the other as being a substantial duplicate of the allowed claim. See MPEP § 706.03(k).

Claim 5 is objected to under 37 CFR 1.75 as being a substantial duplicate of claim 3. Claim 5 does not have antecedent basis in claim 2, but to claim 1, therefore, it is a duplicate of claim 3 where the broadcast signal limitation was first introduced.

Claims 6, 7, and 8 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75 as being a substantial duplicate of claim 4. Claims 6, 7, and 8 have their antecedent basis in claim1, and not in claims 2,3, and 5, respectively, as indicated.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1 through 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over applicant's own admitted prior art (hereinafter "AAPP") in view of Hiroshi Morohoshi et al., US Patent No. 6,219,303 (hereinafter Morohoshi).

The applicant's AAPP appears in paragraphs [0003] through [0008] of the specification: A video receiver for inputting a broadcast signal received through an antenna and a tuner [paragraph 0004], comprising: a microcomputer controlling an operation of the video receiver;, time count means for counting time [paragraph 0005]; time information extraction means for extracting time information included in the input broadcast signal, and for acquiring correction time information; and time correction means for correcting the time count means based on the correction time information extracted by the time information extraction means [paragraph 0006].

The AAPP [paragraph 0009], does not disclose: " a notification that the time correction means has corrected the time count means is made by a monitor output unit connected to the video receiver " .

Morohoshi, however, discloses an electronic device with clock function, and time correction method, where a decision tree (Figure 6) is utilized to determine whether to change/ correct the time (Column 4, lines 58-67; column 5, lines1-5). A warning display (notification) is then generated (Figure 3, column 5, lines 5-11).

Therefore, the combination of AAPP and Morohoshi as a whole would have rendered obvious to one of ordinary skills in the art " A video receiver for inputting a broadcast signal received through an antenna and a tuner, comprising:
a microcomputer controlling an operation of the video receiver; time count means for counting time; time information extraction means for extracting time information included in the input broadcast signal, and for acquiring correction time information; and
time correction means for correcting the time count means based on the correction time information extracted by the time information extraction means, wherein a notification that the time correction means has corrected the time count means is made by a monitor output unit connected to the video receiver. “ as claimed.

Claim 2: The video receiver according to claim 1, wherein the notification that the time correction means has corrected the time count means is made by displaying the notification on a television monitor connected, as the monitor output unit, to the video receiver. (Rejected as claim 1, AAPP , Morohoshi (Figure 3, column 5, lines 5-11).

Claim 3: The video receiver according to claim 1, wherein one of an EPG, an EDS, a CCD, and a T'TEXT is received as a broadcast of transmitting the broadcast signal for acquiring the correction time information. (Rejected as claim 1, AAPP (paragraph [0008]))

Claim 4: The video receiver according to claim 1, wherein a broadcast of transmitting a voice signal representing a time signal sound at a certain time is received as a broadcast of transmitting the broadcast signal for acquiring the correction time information. (Rejected as claim 1, AAPP (paragraph [0007]))

Claim 5: The video receiver according to claim 2, wherein one of an EPG, an EDS, a CCD, and a T'TEXT is received as a broadcast of transmitting the broadcast signal for acquiring the correction time information. (Rejected by the same analysis as applied to claims 1 and 2)

Claim 6: The video receiver according to claim 2, wherein a broadcast of transmitting a voice signal representing a time signal sound at a certain time is received as a broadcast of transmitting the broadcast signal for acquiring the correction time information. (Rejected by the same analysis as applied to claims 1 and 2)

Claim 7: The video receiver according to claim 3, wherein a broadcast of transmitting a voice signal representing a time signal sound at a certain time is received as a broadcast of transmitting the broadcast signal for acquiring the correction time information. (Rejected by the same analysis as applied to claims 1 and 3)

Claim 8: The video receiver according to claim 5, wherein a broadcast of transmitting a voice signal representing a time signal sound at a certain time is received as a broadcast of transmitting the broadcast signal for acquiring the correction time information. (Rejected by the same analysis as applied to claims 1 and 5)

Contacts

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to James R. Marandi whose telephone number is (571) 270-1843. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 AM- 5:00 PM M-F, EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Vu Le can be reached on (571) 272-7332. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/ James R. Marandi/
Patent Examiner

/Vu Le/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 4157
Patent Training Academy